DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 032 HE 007 066

AUTHOR Krop, Lois P.
TITLE A Strategy for Obtaining a Performance-Oriented Training Program for Social Work Field Instructors.
PUB DATE 11 Jun 75
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Educational Change; Field Experience Programs; *Higher Education; Instructional Staff; Methods Courses; Models; *Performance Based Education; Policy Formation; Questionnaires; *Social Work; Surveys; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This document investigates the successful effort to develop and implement a strategy for obtaining a performance-oriented training program for Barry College School of Social Work Field instructors. The mission of the project was to create a system of influence to concert activity so that the educational policy of the school could be shaped to facilitate training of field instructors. A survey was constructed and sent to all active field instructors to determine whether they felt a performance--oriented training program would be helpful to them in teaching students. Results of the questionnaire showed that the large majority of clinical faculty strongly desired such a training program. The results of the survey were presented to the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors. That association passed a motion formally requesting the school to design and carry out performance-oriented training for clinical faculty. This request was then taken to the Field Instruction Committee who passed a similar motion. The proposal was then presented to the Dean of the School of Social Work who appropriated money for the program. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118032

A STRATEGY FOR OBTAINING A PERFORMANCE-ORIENTED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SOCIAL WORK FIELD INSTRUCTORS

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY SYSTEMS MODULE

by

Lois P. Krop, M.S.W.

Barry College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DR. JAMES CHINN, CLUSTER COORDINATOR

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

June 11, 1975

HE 007 065

Abstract of

A STRATEGY FOR OBTAINING A PERFORMANCE-ORIENTED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SOCIAL WORK FIELD INSTRUCTORS

by Lois P. Krop

This investigation was a successful effort to develop and implement a strategy for obtaining a performance-oriented training program for Barry College School of Social Work field instructors. Prior to this study there was no in-service training in educational methods offered by the school for clinical faculty. The mission of this project was to create a system of influence to concert activity in order to shape the educational policy of the school to provide the necessary training for field instructors.

It was decided to implement change through existing governmental channels. A survey was constructed and sent to all active field instructors to determine whether they felt a performance-oriented training program would be helpful to them in teaching students. Results of the questionnaire showed that the large majority of clinical faculty strongly desired such a training program. The results of this survey were presented to the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors. That association passed a motion formally requesting the school to design and carry out performance-oriented training for clinical faculty. This request was then taken to the Field Instruction Committee who passed a similar motion. The proposal was then presented to the Dean of the School of Social Work

who appropriated money for the program.

Thus, activity was concerted to influence the decision makers of the school. This resulted in shaping educational policy to obtain a performance-oriented training program for social work field instructors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	3
3.	PROCEDURES	10
4.	RESULTS	13
5.	RECOMMENDATIONS	18
6.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
7.	APPENDIXES	23

INTRODUCTION

> Today is not yesterday. We ourselves change; how can our Works and Thoughts, if they are always to be the fittest, continue always the same? Change, indeed, is painful; yet ever needful.
>
> Thomas Carlyle

Schools of social work, like many educational institutions, tend to prefer the old and tried ways and are often highly resistant to change. They generally evince a predilection for the devil they know rather than the devil they do not know. Frequently, they follow the axiom Lord Falkland expressed during the English Civil Wars, "When it is not necessary to change, it is not necessary to change."

This investigation was a successful effort to convince the Barry College School of Social Work that it was necessary to change their in-service training policies for clinical faculty in an effort to improve the quality of practicum teaching for students. The project was undertaken to develop and implement a strategy for obtaining a performance-oriented training program for Barry College field instructors. Prior to this study there was no in-service training in educational methods offered by the school for clinical faculty. The policy of the college was to hold a general orientation seminar for field instructors at the beginning of each school year. This seminar had diffuse objectives and there was little or no discussion of specific methods of field teaching.

The mission of this study was to apply influence on the political system of Barry College School of Social Work so that the school would establish the policy of offering a performance-oriented training program for field teachers. The strategy which evolved from this investigation can be used as a model by other schools of social work who also realize the necessity for offering their clinical faculty training in concrete, performance-oriented field teaching. Indeed, "change is painful," but certainly in this area it is needed.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Organizing and structuring the field-supervised experience is a problem for social work education as for many other disciplines. There is a genuine necessity for field instructors to be trained in the use of teaching strategies which systematize and order learning. It is a crucial concern in social work education because students receive the majority of their graduate instruction in the field. For example, students in the Barry College School of Social Work spend three days a week in social service agencies where they are engaged in the actual practice of social work under the supervision of field teachers.

Field instructors are persons who are employed by and based in the social agency and are selected by the agency to train students for competent entry into their profession. They are then designated as clinical faculty by the college for the purposes of field instruction. Field teachers frequently have only one or two students each year. They are primarily practitioners of their profession, not educators. They have been taught to practice social work, not teach it. Usually they have been thrust into their teaching roles without preparation for the change. They have little exposure to learning theories and minimal knowledge of instructional strategies. How can they be expected to provide high calibre, competency-based instruction without any training

in modern methodologies of education?

There is very little structure or order to social work field teaching. The need for systematic tools for field instructors to use in teaching and evaluating their effectiveness is frequently pointed out in the literature.[1] At present, field instructors generally teach their students whatever casework theories and concepts seem suitable in relation to the cases they are handling at the time. There is no planned curriculum with logical sequence, continuity, or cumulative learning. Therefore, it is not surprising that social work students and educators are continuously identifying problems such as the difficulty in integrating class and field instruction.

A review of pertinent literature reveals that throughout the years students have been placed in agencies to be taught in any way their individual field instructor thinks is best.[2] The student-supervisor relationship was originally based on the apprenticeship model where the student learned his art by working under a skilled master for a period of time. This relationship remains essentially tutorial in nature. Usually, a small number of carefully chosen cases are entrusted to the student

---

[1]Sheldon D. Rose, "Students View their Supervision," Journal of the National Association of Social Workers, X (April, 1965), pp. 90-96.

[2]S. Clement Brown and E. R. Gloyne, The Field Training of Social Workers (London: George Allen and Uniwin LTD, 1966), pp. 37-38.

after consultation. Students then record their own accounts of interviews with clients which form the basis of educational discussions with the supervisor to which regular weekly time is given. There is no organized development of curriculum and field instructors teach whatever method and content they deem appropriate at the time.

Designing an orderly framework for agency teaching is particularly difficult because practicum work takes place in dynamic settings where it is hard to organize instruction. Recognizing how problematic it is to arrange a planned curriculum for students in social agencies, Jeanette Regensburg commented:

> Among all the recent challenges to social work education, none has been more stimulating than the widespread interest in putting order into the natural disorder of the graduate student's experience in his field work setting. Clients--whether individuals, small groups or communities--do not conform to the logical principles of curriculum building nor do the operating procedures of a social agency, hospital, school or prison. Indeed, they need not and should not. The question then arises, since there is general acceptance that the learning experiences provided through field instruction are essential to the achievement of the objectives of the social work curriculum, of how to select, order and provide those experiences in the best interests of the student.[3]

Field instructors must utilize modern educational technology and theory to progress from random apprenticeship

---

[3]Jeanette Regensburg, "Report of Exploratory Project in Field Instruction," Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education: Old Problems and New Proposals (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1966) p. 23.

training to structured education of students. In order to accomplish this, field teachers need to be trained in performance-oriented methods of instruction so they can organize and order their field teaching.

In recent years, teacher training institutions throughout the country have been moving in the direction of competency-based, performance-oriented teaching.[4] Advocates of this trend place emphasis on the way teachers demonstrate teaching knowledge and skills. That demonstration must be observable, with concrete, measurable objectives and criterion tests. Thus, specific instructional objectives requiring performances which can be evaluated take on major importance in a performance-based teaching program.

To operationalize a method of performance-oriented field teaching, field instruction must be conceptualized as a course for which content can be selected, behavioral objectives defined, learning activities planned, and student learning assessed. In order to enable them to utilize this strategy, agency-based teachers need a training program to develop an understanding of the nature of setting measurable objectives, choosing learning experiences, and evaluating students' performance.

---

[4]W. Robert Houston, Performance Education: Strategies and Resources for Developing a Competency Based Teacher Education Program, (New York, New York: State Education Department and Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, 1972), pp. 1-25.

In meetings of the Barry College School of Social Work field instructors, the need for seminars and workshops explicating specific methods of field teaching has frequently been identified. In a survey of clinical faculty the traditional orientation seminar offered by the school was rated as relatively ineffective.[5] In field instructor meetings a need was expressed for seminars and workshops emphasizing performance-oriented field teaching methods (see Appendix A).

The necessity for establishing an in-service training program discussing methods of performance-oriented field teaching has not only been expressed by field instructors but also by the associate directors of field instruction. Dr. David Fike and Dr. Harvey Abrams, Associate Directors of Field Instruction for Barry College School of Social Work, stated that a performance-oriented training program for field teachers would be a valuable asset to the school and would be helpful in increasing the effectiveness of field teaching. The importance of providing such a training program has also been identified in a previous practicum by this author.[6]

---

[5]Lois P. Krop, Developing and Implementing Effective Modes of Communication Between the School of Social Work and Agency-Based Faculty, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100265, May, 1975.

[6]Lois P. Krop, Developing and Evaluating a Performance-Oriented Training Program for Community-Based Faculty of a School of Social Work, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100262, May, 1975.

The problem was how to develop a strategy for influencing the educational policy of Barry College School of Social Work so that the college would provide the necessary in-service training program. Although field instructors had often verbalized their need for performance-oriented training, the school of social work had continued to offer clinical faculty only the usual general orientation seminar. To effect change, the political hierarchy which shapes educational policy for the school had to be officially informed of the field instructors' desires and influenced to gratify them. Creating this system of influence was particularly problematic because performance-oriented field instruction is a startling innovation in social work--albeit, a long overdue one.

Who are the policy makers of the Barry College School of Social Work? McCabe stated that "Policy decisions are made at all levels and all are made in a political framework. Groups and individuals and their attitudes and influence are an integral part of every policy decision."[7]

In examining the line-staff organization of the School of Social Work in order to determine the relative influence of individual interests and interest groups, it was observable that the ultimate decisions concerning

---

[7]Robert H. McCabe, Educational Policy Systems (Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1973), p. 39.

policies for clinical faculty are made by the Dean of the school in consultation with the Director and Associate Directors of Field Instruction. Their decisions are influenced by the Field Instruction Committee which is composed of the Director and Associate Directors of Field Instruction, two members of the academic faculty, two members of the clinical faculty, and two students. The policy decisions recommended by the Field Instruction Committee are in turn influenced by input from the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors whose membership is composed of all clinical faculty (see Appendix B).

Banfield points out that:

> To concert activity for any purpose--to arrange a picnic, build a building, or pass an ordinance, for example--a more or less elaborate system of influence must be created: the appropriate people must be persuaded, deceived, coerced, inveigled, or otherwise induced to do what is required of them.[8]

Having established the need for training field instructors in performance-oriented field teaching, the problem was how to create a system of influence to concert activity that succeeds in implementing such a program. It was the mission of this investigation to identify the way influence works within the school of social work and shape the educational policy of the college to provide the necessary training for field instructors.

---

[8] Edward C. Banfield, Political Influence (New York: The Free Press, 1961), p. 3.

PROCEDURES

In order to devise a strategy to mold the policy of Barry College School of Social Work in order to obtain a performance-oriented training program for field instructors, Banfield's conceptual scheme for studying patterns of influence by which action is concerted was utilized. His four points which reflect the criteria by which it is decided what data are relevant and what are not are:

1. Who has influence and who is subject to it?
2. How does influence work?
3. What are the terms upon which influence is expended?
4. How is action concerted by influence?[9]

It was determined that although the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors is at the bottom of the political hierarchy, the association wields considerable influence on the school's policy making structure particularly in the area of field instruction. The final decisions are made by the Dean in cooperation with the Directors of Field Instruction but their decision making is heavily influenced by input from the Field Instruction Committee and the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors. This influence rests primarily upon a sense of obligation of the school of social work to gratify the wishes and meet the needs of the clinical

---

[9]Banfield, pp. 4-7.

faculty since they train students in the field without receiving monetary compensation from the school.

It was assumed that the college recognizes that quality social work education could not exist without the goodwill of agency personnel willing to be responsible for practicum training of students. Therefore, it logically followed that if the field teachers expressed their needs clearly and concretely in an official recommendation, the school would make every effort to respect their desires. However, the ultimate decision makers first required information regarding what the clinical faculty felt was required to help them be more effective educators.

In order to inform the political hierarchy of the needs of field instructors and to mobilize forces which would contribute to a change in educational policy, this author proposed to begin at the grass roots level. In the past, clinical faculty's wishes for periodic training seminars were informally expressed and no official action was taken (see Appendix A). This time, a survey was constructed and sent to all 104 active field instructors to determine whether the majority felt a performance-oriented training program would be helpful to them in teaching students (see Appendix C). Results of this questionnaire were tabulated and analyzed.

The results of the survey were then presented to the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors. Members of the association were impressed with the findings of

this survey of their colleagues and unanimously passed a motion formally requesting the Barry College School of Social Work to develop and implement a performance-oriented training program for clinical faculty (see Appendix D). This proposal was then put on the agenda of the following Field Instruction Committee meeting as item number one.

The field instructors formal request for performance-oriented training seminars was discussed at the next Field Instruction Committee meeting and the committee unanimously passed a resolution to develop and implement such a program (see Appendix E). This author was subsequently appointed to an ad hoc committee to design the program (see Appendix F). The Director of Field Instruction and the Associate Directors of Field Instruction supported this plan. It was then presented to the Dean of the School of Social Work who authorized money to design and implement the training program (see Appendix G).

RESULTS

The opinionnaire which was constructed to determine which tools and strategies Barry College School of Social Work field instructors preferred to help them be more effective teachers was sent to all 104 active clinical faculty. Responses were received from eighty-four. This was an 80.76 percent response, which is particularly excellent in view of the fact that no return envelope was enclosed. The high percentage of replies seems to indicate that field instructors are interested in utilizing additional tools and training which are designed to improve their teaching skills. It also suggests that they are desirous of influencing school educational policy and decision making, especially about matters which affect their performance.

The results of the questionnaire were:

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	No Answer
A) Detailed descriptions of content of academic courses	59.2%	28.5%	6.2%	6.1%
B) Specific suggestions for relating course content to field work	57.8%	36.1%	2.4%	3.7%
C) Listing of written course assignments relating to field work	51.8%	35.8%	7.4%	4.9%
D) School sponsored periodic seminars and workshops for the purpose of:				
1) explaining course content	48.1%	28.5%	14.9%	8.4%

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	No Answer
2) discussing performance-oriented field teaching methods	60.4%	30.9%	3.9%	4.8%
3) field instructors presenting their methods of field teaching	54.2%	27.2%	13.7%	4.9%

All of the proposed methods for improving field teaching were rated very positively by respondents. This indicated that they would welcome a variety of innovative tools for use in practicum teaching. The suggestion of school sponsored periodic seminars and workshops for the purpose of discussing performance-oriented field teaching methods received the highest rating, with 91.3 percent of the respondents indicating that these would be either helpful or very helpful in their field teaching. Thus, clinical faculty expressed a strong desire for performance-oriented training in field instruction. Workshops explaining course content were least preferred.

Meaningful comments were written on the survey by approximately 22 percent of respondents. Several mentioned that they felt a need for training in concrete, specific methods of teaching in the field. Many positive comments were made, such as "Great idea," and "This would be a big help." A few specified that they felt they would benefit from an explication of a strategy of field instruction by objectives. Two remarked that the college needs to provide in-service training which focuses on explicit methods of field teaching.

An analysis of the data received from the survey of clinical faculty was presented to the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors at the following meeting. After discussion they unanimously passed a motion that the Barry College School of Social Work should "develop and implement a performance-oriented training program for field instructors." They requested that field instructors have input into planning and teaching of the training program (see Appendix D).

The field instructors formal request was discussed in the next Field Instruction Committee meeting. They passed a motion recommending that the school provide a performance-oriented seminar during the spring semester with monthly follow-up seminars thereafter (see Appendix E). This author was appointed to an ad hoc committee consisting of academic and clinical faculty for implementing such a program.

The Field Instruction Committee's proposal was presented to the Dean of the School of Social Work, Dr. John Riley. He responded by approving the proposal and appropriating money to design and carry out the training. This author was commissioned to present the initial phase of the training program.

The first phase of the performance-oriented training program has already been implemented. A full day seminar and workshop was held. After training workshop leaders and writing a training guide, a performance-

oriented method of field instruction by objectives was presented by this author. The morning consisted of a didactic lecture using overhead slides presented to the entire group. The large group then broke up into small workshops who went through the process of developing learning modules following the guidelines of field instruction by objectives manual which was developed by the author. The seminar was attended by 111 clinical and academic faculty. Evaluations of the first phase of the training program were overwhelmingly favorable.

As a direct result of the activity connected with this practicum, this author was elected president of the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors for 1975-6. Planning meetings have already been scheduled with the officers of the association, Dean of the School of Social Work, Director and Associate Directors of Field Instruction. A primary objective of these meetings will be to ensure that the school continue to provide a training program for clinical faculty which will carry through with the thrust already begun.

In conclusion, utilizing existing governmental channels, activity was concerted to create a system of influence which resulted in obtaining a performance-oriented training program for Barry College School of Social Work field instructors. In spite of the fact that innovative change is painful and usually resisted, the decision makers of college policy were persuaded to

do what was required of them once they were officially and impactfully informed of the desires of the clinical faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the alacrity with which the decision makers of Barry College School of Social Work gratified the expressed desires of clinical faculty, and the enthusiasm with which field instructors greeted the initial phase of the training program, the following recommendations arising from this study have been presented to the Dean of the Social Work School and the Associate Directors of Field Instruction:

1. Follow-up seminars on performance-oriented field instruction should be designed and implemented as recommended by the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors and the Field Instruction Committee.
2. These seminars should be evaluated with the results tabulated and analyzed.
3. The learning modules which are constructed in the training program should be compiled and made available to field instructors for use in organizing and structuring field teaching.
4. A detailed description of the process of field instruction by objectives should be published so that this teaching strategy can be utilized by other schools of social work.
5. Barry College School of Social Work should

formulate an educational policy of providing regular, on-going seminars for clinical faculty dealing with concrete, specific methods of field teaching.

6. Reports of this study should be published so that other social work educators can use it as a model for concerting influence to obtain performance-oriented training for field instructors.

The Dean of the School of Social Work and the Associate Directors of Field Instruction were favorably impressed by this project and have taken the following action:

1. Money has been appropriated to design and implement phase two of the performance-oriented training program.
2. Provisions are being made to evaluate the training program.
3. The learning modules which are being constructed in the program are being compiled and revised. They will be made available for clinical faculty to use in field teaching.
4. Barry College School of Social Work has adopted the educational policy of providing regular in-service training for field instructors focusing on performance-oriented field teaching.

The election of this author as President of the Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors assures that this policy will be continued at least for the forthcoming school year. A paper detailing the process of field instruction by objectives has been accepted for publication by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Another paper describing the results of this study is being prepared to be sent to ERIC for consideration for publication.

The results and recommendations of this investigation respresent positive change for Barry College School of Social Work. Because of the activity of this study, the college's educational policy has been shaped to provide performance-oriented in-service training for clinical faculty which should contribute to making field teaching for students more effective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banathy, Bela H. Instructional Systems. Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

Banfield, Edward C. Political Influence. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Brown, S. Clement, and E. R. Gloyne. The Field Training of Social Workers. London: George Allen and Uniwin LTD, 1966.

Conant, James Bryant. Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Easton, David. A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Houston, W. Robert. Performance Education: Strategies and Resources for Developing a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program. New York: New York State Education Department and Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teaching Education, 1972.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Learning Society. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1968.

Krop, Lois P. Developing and Evaluating a Performance-Oriented Training Program for Community-Based Faculty of a School of Social Work. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100262, May, 1975.

_____. Developing and Implementing Effective Modes of Communication Between the School of Social Work and Agency-Based Faculty. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100265, May, 1975.

McCabe, Robert H. Educational Policy Systems. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1973.

Regensburg, Jeanette. "Report of Exploratory Project in Field Instruction," Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education: Old Problems and New Proposals, New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1966.

Rose, Sheldon D. "Students View their Supervison," Journal of the National Association of Social Workers, X (April, 1965), 90-96.

Trumcn, David B. The Governmental Process. New York: Knopt, 1951.

APPENDIX A

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF BARRY COLLEGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK FIELD INSTRUCTORS

Field Instructors meeting--September, 1974

> "The subject of in-service education for field instructors was raised. Comments were made that the general orientation meeting traditionally held in the spring was not effective. Field instructors requested that the school look into the possibility of providing workshops for clinical faculty in which specific methods and techniques of teaching would be discussed."

Field Instruction Committee meeting--November 6, 1974

> "The matter of training for field instructors was discussed. Ms. Lois Krop reported that 111 field teachers had attended the workshop on performance-based field instruction. She has evaluations from 92 of the attendees and they are overwhelmingly positive. There seemed to be agreement in the committee that there should be a follow-up session. Probably it should include some other information related to performance-oriented field teaching, field instruction by objectives, and a chance to discuss that material. Some members reported efforts by some field instructors to use Field Instruction by Objectives during the current semester and there was considerable enthusiasm about that approach to field teaching."

Association of Agency-Paid Field Instructors meeting--November 13, 1974

> "The school places responsibility on field instructor for the students' level of skill. However, the school gives the field instructor little or no preparation for supervising or teaching. Several people felt the school does not give proper attention to field instructors' evaluations and recommendations with regard to the "Risk" student. The group felt in general that it is important to them to have the school provide a training program in performance-oriented field teaching so that field instructors could improve their teaching skills."

APPENDIX B

Line-Staff organization of Barry College School of Social Work

APPENDIX C

How helpful would the following be to you in your teaching of social work students in the field?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
A) Detailed descriptions of content of academic courses	_____	_____	_____
B) Specific suggestions for relating course content to field work	_____	_____	_____
C) Listing of written course assignments relating to field work	_____	_____	_____
D) School sponsored periodic seminars and workshops for the purpose of:			
1) explaining course content	_____	_____	_____
2) discussing performance-oriented field teaching methods	_____	_____	_____
3) field instructors presenting their methods of field teaching	_____	_____	_____

Minutes of Agency Paid Field Instructors Association
December 12, 1974
Dale Paulison, President -- Presiding
Faculty Representation -- Dr. David Fike
Mr. William Barr
Dr. Harvey Abrams

(1) Discussion regarding field instructors representation on faculty committees was continued. All positions have not yet been filled. Faculty representatives stated that field instructor representatives can request an item be placed on a committee agenda. Communication problems were again mentioned. Due to the Associations' limited monies, Mr. Barr said he would ask if our meeting announcements, etc. could be enclosed in the school's mailings to field instructors. F.I. agreed that two weeks notice should be given regarding date of meetings.

(2) Lois Krop reported that she had conveyed field instructors desire to continue graduated faculty rankings rather than one uniform ranking for all field instructors regardless of ability or length of service. Mr. Barr offered that this more for one uniform ranking was a college issue and had not been initiated by the School of Social Work.

(3) Last year, following field instructors seminar, Lois Krop sent questionnaires to the participants concerning whether or not they desired further training. Answers revealed that we did. Dr. Fike stated that field instructors like the idea of being teachers and questioned if the school should focus on this. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED: WE, AS A GROUP, RECOMMENDED THAT BARRY COLLEGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A PERFORMANCE ORIENTATED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR FIELD INSTRUCTORS. Field instructors should have input in planning, teaching, etc. An independent ad hoc committee was formed composed of those people already on the Field Instruction Committee plus interested others. Dr. Fike as chairman of the F.I. Committee agreed to put this matter on the committee agenda and take it on as an additional responsibility.

(4) The next issue brought up was the question of two field days per week for first semester, first year students. Everyone present felt this was inadequate. Motion made and passed that these students have three field days per week instead of the present arrangement.

(5) The last matter presented precipitated much discussion and time limitations caused talking until the next meeting. Motion made was: by the third week of school, the first semester student should know what agency he is to be assigned to and have an interciew with prospective supervisor. Agreement to acceptance of field placement should be mutual between student and instructor.

Amendment to the above motion was passed saying that preparatory to selection interview, the school should automatically provide GRC records, undergraduate grade point, cummulative folder, etc. The student would know that this was being done.

The considerable discussion on these points centered subject of confidentially, prejudicing potential supervisor, and use of verbal information passed from one instructor to another.

Next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 23, 1975, at 2 PM in the A/V room of the School of Social Work.

Respectfully submitted

MARCIA FRUMBERG
Secretary/Treasurer

BARRY COLLEGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

FIELD INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

MINUTES

The January 22, 1975 meeting of the Field Instruction Committee was covered by David Fike, the Chairperson. Also present were Bob Morgan, Ethel Lawrence, Earl Sylva, Laurie Forbes, Bill Galagher, Harvey Abrams, Bill Barr, Lois Krop, Diame Lindner, and Claudia Antuna.

The Chairperson reported one item of old business and 17 items of new business. The old business relates to the matter of minority content in the field. About 95% of the non-discrimination pledges and about 60% of the survey responses are in. This matter is to be pursued (by Faculty decision) by a joint sub-committee of this committee and the Minority Concerns Committee. We are to name 3 persons; Bill Gallagher and David Fike will be two of them. A third will be recruited.

The 17 items of new business have been suggested by various constituents (the field instructors suggested 4; students suggested 6; faculty members have suggested 3; and an individual student suggested 4). Their content is generally encompassed by the following seven general issues:

1. TRAINING FOR FIELD INSTRUCTORS
2. Change in the field/class plan
3. Change in the system of student assignment
4. Change in the system of student evaluation
5. Change in the system of agency evaluation
6. Redefine "satisfactory" completion of field training: change from a time-counting system to one in which accomplishment of objectives is carefully monitored
7. Students should have copies of the field instruction manual

It was announced that Bill Barr is leaving the director of field instruction position after this year and that a replacement will be hired.

There was extensive discussion related to Item #5. Specifically there was consideration of what is the current practice in agency evaluation (informative and evaluative statements by students and by liaison persons). It was moved and seconded that agency files are to be open to agency representatives:

(1) individual field instructors are to have access to records about them and

(2) any agency employee is to have access to the records about his/her agency except evaluations

Field Instruction Committee Minutes, 1/22/75

of other individual employees.
It was passed without a dissenting vote.

Item #7 was also discussed. It was moved and seconded that

(1) several copies of the field instruction manual should be put on reserve in the library for student use and

(2) field instructors should be encouraged to share their copies of the manual with their students.

It was passed without a dissenting vote.

Item #2 was discussed next. The field instructor's group has recommended returning to a plan of 3 days per week in the field in all four semesters. Many of them find it impossible to teach the necessary beginning practice skills in two days per week. Also some (expecially in hospitals) cannot give sensible case responsibility to students with the Monday to Friday gap. The recommendation (not around motion) of the field instruction committee is that field training in first semester should continue to be 2 days per week as a rule and that the field instruction staff should analyze the special circumstances of those agencies that have difficulty with the semester one plan. There seem to be some options. An extra half or whole day for extra credit might be one. A delayed start, with 3 days per week training in the last half semester is another.

Lastly the matter of training for field instructors (Item #1) was debated. THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S GROUP HAS ASKED THAT SUCH A PROGRAM SHOULD BE OFFERED DURING THIS ACADEMIC YEAR. THEY WANT IT TO FOCUS ON "HOW TO TEACH" PRACTICE SKILLS. THEY WANT IT TO BE MORE PRACTICAL THAN THEORETICAL. IT WAS MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE FIELD INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE SHOULD RECOMMEND A 2-DAY WORKSHOP DURING THIS SPRING SEMESTER WITH A MONTHLY FOLLOW-UP WORKSHOP THEREAFTER. THEY SHOULD BE PERFORMANCE-ORIENTED, CARRYING FORWARD THE THRUST THAT WE HAVE BEGUN. PRESENT, PAST AND POTENTIAL FIELD INSTRUCTORS SHOULD BE INVITED. IT WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next meeting is set for 4:00 p.m., Wednesday the 5th of February.

FIELD INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE MINUTES, 1/22/75

Copies to:

Fike	Morgan	Laurie Forbes, Box 284
Barr	Krop	Bill Gallagher, Box 231
Abrams	Lawrence	John Skow, Box 259
Miller	Suanna Wilson	Mary Meyer, Box 307
Lindner	Dale Paulison	

Vera Wolfe
Joyce Padova

BARRY COLLEGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

FIELD INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

MINUTES

The February 5, 1975 meeting of the Field Instruction Committee was convened by Chairperson David Fike. Harvey Abrams, Mary Meyer, Bill Barr, Ethel Lawrence, Lois Krop, Gracie Miller, Suanna Wilson, Bill Gallagher, and Laurie Forbes also attended. Diane Lindner had called and excused herself.

Some corrections to the January 22nd minutes were made. The motion regarding access to the field instruction manual for students should have also contained the provision that students would be informed of its availability. It should also be noted that Suanna Wilson attended the January 22nd meeting.

The set of 7 agenda items listed in the 1-22-75 minutes was considered. The Chairperson observed that continued debate of a 3-day-per-week first semester should be delayed until results of a survey of field instructors' opinions is completed.

THERE WAS SOME CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE WORKSHOPS FOR FIELD INSTRUCTORS (ITEM #1). LOIS KROP, SUANNA WILSON, AND DIANE LINDNER WERE NAMED TO SERVE AS ADVISORS TO BILL BARR IN PLANNING THE WORKSHOPS.

The Chairperson shared ideas from a draft of the "field instruction" section of the reaccreditation self-study that is currently being prepared. It is a summary report of progress during the past three years. The draft reported mainly on (1) the development of the large systems track; (2) the work in the area of minority concerns and field training; and (3) the inclusion of BSW field training. Members suggested that we add information in relation to field research that's been done, planning for field instructor training, and the new methods of School-agency communication.

It seems proper to delay further consideration of the agency evaluation matter (Item #5). The field instructors' organization currently has a committee working directly with the Dean to settle the issue of availability of School records about agencies to agency representatives. Until that is settled it seems unwise to plan to add any new evaluative material to those records.

The question was raised: "What should be the School policy in relation to field instructors reviewing papers that students have written about the agency?" There was some discussion of the Youth Services matter of 2 years ago. Some members recalled that some principles were established in the deliberations in that case but there was uncertainty as to whether or not they were written, and if so where. This will be added as an agenda item for the next meeting.

Field Instruction Committee Minutes, 2/5/75

The matter of the form for evaluation of students was debated. A student had expressed the position that numbered items of that form are arbitrary and often non-applicable. There was debate of the matter and then the conclusion that the form is satisfactory in that the field instructor has always had the option of using it (1) in its totality; (2) in part; or (3) as a guide in the preparation of a narrative statement.

Two field instructor members expressed the same viewpoint, that some Barry students seemed not to have had instruction in principles of ethical practice, including confidential treatment of case information. There was a discussion of this and there seemed to be agreement that this might be dealt with as part of an extended orientation for beginning students next year. For example, there might be a session related to field instruction, prepared and presented by some field instructors.

Field instructor members also observed that some second year students seem unclear about good practice in job hunting. There was discussion of ways of getting that information to students.

The Chairperson will announce the next committee meeting early in March. The Field instructors' organization will meet late this month. It seems important to delay the next committee meeting until that meeting has been held.

David F. Fike
Chairperson

FIELD INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

The Field Instruction Committee has been meeting and making decisions after a late start in the Fall. In November it authorized the study of agency practice and opportunities in relation to social services for members of minority groups. Some of those questionnaires are still out (if yours is one of them, please return it) and a careful analysis of them has yet to be done, but a cursory examination indicates that we are offering considerable diversity of training opportunities in regard to staffing and client population compositions.

It was also decided in November that the School should continue to appoint field instructors employing the current progressive ranking system based upon years of field instruction service with Barry.

There has been discussion of adoption of a system of informational and evaluative reports about agencies and field instruction. The current belief of committee members seems to be that we should first adopt a set of procedures for field instructor access to School records about them and then consider what kinds of data should be gathered and placed in the records. There is now an Ad Hoc Committee of field instructors working on that procedural problem.

THE COMMITTEE HAS RECOMMENDED THAT THERE SHOULD BE A WORKSHOP ON PERFORMANCE-ORIENTED FIELD TEACHING METHODS THIS SPRING. THAT REQUEST HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE DEAN AND TO BILL BARR, DIRECTOR OF FIELD INSTRUCTION, FOR IMPLEMENTATION. SUANNA WILSON, LOIS KROP, AND DIANE LINDNER WILL BE ADVISORS TO BILL BARR IN THE PLANNING OF THE WORKSHOP.

The School has been asked by the field instructors' organization to consider having 3 days per week of field instruction in the first semester. A survey of first year field instructors is now underway to determine attitudinal perspectives. When information from that survey is available further consideration will continue in the field instructors' organization and in this committee.

Committee representatives Ethel Lawrence, Lois Krop, Bob Morgan and Suanna Wilson have been active and valuable in the work of the committee. Thanks to all of you.

David F. Fike, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Writer's Name LOIS F. KROP

Cluster NOVA

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

June 15, 1975
Date

George C. Lloyd, Jr.
Signature of Peer Reader

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

June 18, 1975
Date

Signature of Peer Reader

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

June 20, 1975
Date

Signature of Peer Reader

. . . . . .

I certify that I have read this practicum report and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards for practicums in the Doctor of Education Program.

Date

Signature of Practicum Director